## **REMARKS**

## 35 U.S.C. § 102:

Claims 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,366,933 (Ball et al). Claims 21, 22 and 23 have been amended to call for indicating the difference between the cached and current versions by blanking the common material between the cached and the current versions such that only new material in the current version is displayed.

It is respectfully submitted that Ball does not teach showing only new material in a current version of a web page. Instead, Ball shows all differences while eliminating the common part between two versions of a web page. See column 19, lines 1-11. In contrast, according to some embodiments of the present invention, only new material on a page and nothing more is is displayed. As such, claims 21-23 are not anticipated by Ball.

Although the amendments to claims 21-23 are after final, it is respectfully submitted that they should be entered because they put the application in condition for allowance.

## 35 U.S.C. § 103:

Claims 1-4, 6-11 and 13-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,366,933 (Ball et al) and U.S. Patent No. 5,142,619 (Webster, III). Independent claims 1, 8 and 15 call for a graphical user interface of a navigation bar with a subtract button image. The Examiner concedes that neither Ball nor Webster disclose a navigation bar with a subtract button image. See Paper No. 7, page 3. However, the Examiner concludes that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Webster's compare button [66] by changing the text "compare" to an image of a minus sign. It is respectfully submitted that there is no suggestion or motivation to change Webster's compare button to an image of a minus sign.

The activation of Webster's compare button 66 does not lead to the same result as selecting the subtract button image according to some embodiments of the present invention. For example, when Webster's compare button 66 is selected, two files are compared side by side

in windows W1 and W2. See column 4, lines 28-33; Figure 4. When the text in windows W1 and W2 are best aligned, the differences appear in window W3. See column 4, lines 28-33. For example, when the words "TEXT" and "TENT" are compared, the differences between the letters "X" and "N" appear as a hybrid in window W3. See Figure 4. In this case, the hybrid letter looks like a backwards "N". That is, the "\" common to both the "X" and "N" is omitted from the hybrid letter shown in window W3 such that the remaining portions result in a backward "N." See, Figure 4. Thus, activating Webster's compare button causes two files to be compared such that their similarities and hybrid "letters" are displayed on the screen 60.

In contrast, according to some embodiments of the present invention, when the subtract icon is mouse clicked on, a cached version and a current version of a page are compared and only new, readable, information is displayed on a screen, the rest being subtracted out.

Thereafter, the subtract icon may be selected to toggle between the differenced image and the current server image. There is no side-by-side comparison of text or hybridization of letters on a screen. Thus, Webster's compare button 66 does not "behave in a similar manner" to the claimed subtract button image. Thus, there is no reason to modify Webster's compare button 66 to an image of a minus sign. For at least this reason, it is respectfully submitted that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Even if Webster's compare button 66 is wrongly construed to be the same as a subtract button image in a graphical user interface of a navigation bar, there is no teaching or suggestion to modify Ball in view of Webster. That is, Ball's differencing indicator is part of an HTML document. See column 20, lines 26-32. In fact, there are three links associated with each HTML document, "remember," "diff" and "history." See column 20, lines 31-40. Selecting Ball's "diff" link causes a snapshot facility to invoke htmldiff to display changes in a page since it was last saved by the user. See column 20, lines 37-39. Webster is not believed to teach a "compare" button that is an HTML link. Thus, replacing Ball's "diff" button with the "compare" button of Webster would eliminate Ball's HTML link. If a proposed modification renders the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. See In re Gordon, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir.

1984). Because making the proposed modification would render Ball unsatisfactory for his intended purpose, i.e., to provide an HTML link, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 8 and 15 and the claims dependent therefrom are patentable over Ball in view of Webster.

For the reasons stated above, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider the application. In light of the amendments and arguments herein, it is respectfully urged that the Examiner allow the application to pass to issue.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504 (ITL.0314US).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 1, 2003

21906

Rhonda L. Sheldon, Reg. No. 50,457

TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C 8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100

Houston, Texas 77024 713/468-8880 [Phone] 713/468-8883 [Fax]